

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about August 14, 1947, by Atlas Laboratories, Inc., from Akron, Ohio.

PRODUCT: 168 tubes of *Gambine Injection Ointment* at Denver, Colo.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statements "Use in teat canal in treatment of local inflammation * * * Germicidal - Fungicidal" were false and misleading, since the article would not be effective in the treatment of local inflammatory conditions of the teat canal, and it was not germicidal or fungicidal.

DISPOSITION: December 10, 1947. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

2295. Misbranding of Stoctone, M & M Chicken Spray, and Sulfatone Number Two. U. S. v. 17 Bottles, etc. (F. D. C. No. 23181. Sample Nos. 68434-H to 68436-H, incl.)

LIBEL FILED: June 24, 1947, District of Nebraska.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about May 1, 1947, by the M & M Livestock Products Co., from Clarion, Iowa.

PRODUCT: 10 250-tablet bottles and 7 1,000-tablet bottles of *Stoctone*, 7 1-quart bottles of *M & M Chicken Spray*, and 47 3-pound bottles of *Sulfatone Number Two*, at Pilger, Nebr., together with a number of circulars, which were shipped with the product, entitled "Announcing—New Sulfatone and Stoctone for Livestock and Poultry." Analyses showed that the *Stoctone* consisted essentially of sodium arsanilate, ammonium phenolsulfonate, and boric acid; that the *M & M Chicken Spray* was essentially a petroleum distillate, such as kerosene; and that the *Sulfatone Number Two* consisted essentially of sulfanilamide, sulfathiazole, copper sulfate, potassium iodide, sulfaguanidine, and sulfate of iron with bicarbonate of soda, charcoal, linseed oil meal, and sodium chloride.

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Stoctone*. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the labeling were false and misleading. These statements represented and suggested that the article when used as directed would be effective in the treatment of blackhead and coccidiosis in turkeys and hemorrhagic septicemia (bloody scours) in hogs, whereas it would not be effective for such purposes.

M & M Chicken Spray. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label were false and misleading. These statements represented and suggested that the article contained 100 percent active ingredients and that it would be effective in the treatment of colds, pneumonia, flu, and other respiratory ailments of poultry, whereas it did not contain 100 percent active ingredients and would not be effective for the purposes represented. Further misbranding, Section 502 (e) (1), the label failed to bear the common or usual name of the article; and, Section 502 (b) (2), it failed to bear an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents.

Sulfatone Number Two. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the labeling were false and misleading. These statements represented and suggested that the article would be effective in the treatment of necrotic enteritis, colds, influenza, and scours in hogs, and white diarrhea in small pigs; that it would be effective at breeding time in settling sows; that it would be effective as a treatment for brucellosis during the gestation period and at farrowing time; and that it would be effective to keep hogs healthy. The article would not be effective for such purposes.

DISPOSITION: August 15, 1947. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

DRUG ACTIONABLE BECAUSE OF OMISSION OF, OR UNSATISFACTORY, INGREDIENTS STATEMENTS*

2296. Misbranding of Ramol. U. S. v. Benjamin Ostroff. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$75 and costs. (F. D. C. No. 23234. Sample Nos. 52766-H, 53921-H, 53922-H, 60869-H.)

INFORMATION FILED: October 7, 1947, Western District of Pennsylvania, against Benjamin Ostroff, Pittsburgh, Pa.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about September 20 and October 1, 18, and 30, 1946, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Ohio.

* See also Nos. 2251, 2252, 2255, 2265; veterinary preparations, Nos. 2259, 2295.